



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/058,399	01/30/2002	Keiji Saito	04329.2729	4737

7590

05/07/2004

Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow,
Garrett & Dunner, L.L.P.
1300 I Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3315

EXAMINER

DAO, MINH D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2682

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/058,399

Applicant(s)

SAITO, KEIJI

Examiner

MINH D DAO

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-8,11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kiyokazu (Japanese Application Publication number 06-289955).

Regarding claim 1, Kiyokazu teaches an electronic device (see fig. 4, item DS of the translation of reference Kiyokazu) in which an expansion unit (see fig. 4, item PPM of the translation of reference Kiyokazu) is removably connected, comprising: a command device (see fig. 4, control circuit 23) configured to give a command to supply power to the expansion unit (see section [0007] of the translation of reference Kiyokazu); and a power supply control device configured to start the supply of power to the expansion unit when a command is given by the command device in a state where the electronic device is turned off (see abstract; section [0012], lines 1-5 of the translation of reference Kiyokazu).

Regarding claims 2 and 5 Kiyokazu teaches that the electronic device according to claim 1 including a notification device configured to notify the expansion unit of the on/off state of the main power supply in the electronic device (see abstract; section [0012], lines 1-5 of the translation of reference Kiyokazu; in this case when the PPM unit receives power from the DS, it should also be notified the state of the power circuit 22).

Regarding claims 3 and 6 Kiyokazu teaches that the electronic device according to claim 1 including comprising a receiving device configured to receive from the expansion unit a command to stop the supply of power, and wherein the power supply control unit stops the supply of power to the expansion unit in response to said command from the expansion unit (see section [0008], lines 9-17 of the translation of reference Kiyokazu).

Regarding claim 4, Kiyokazu teaches an electronic device (see fig. 4, item DS of the translation of reference Kiyokazu) in which an expansion unit (see fig. 4, item PPM of the translation of reference Kiyokazu) is removably connected, comprising: a detection device configured to detect whether or not the expansion unit is connected to the connection device; and a power supply control device configured to start the supply of power to the expansion unit when connection of the expansion unit is detected by the detection device in a state where the electronic device is turned off (see section [0008], lines 1-9 of the translation of reference Kiyokazu).

Regarding claim 7, Kiyokazu teaches an expansion unit (see fig. 4, item PPM of the translation of reference Kiyokazu) powered from an electronic device (see fig. 4, item DS of the translation of reference Kiyokazu) for increasing the functions of said electronic device comprising: a detection device configured to detect the presence or absence of power from the electronic device (see section [0008], lines 1-9); and a control device configured to carry out a given processing (see fig. 3, item 10). Reference Kiyokazu also inherently teaches that the given processing is carried out when no operating command comes from the electronic device within a predetermined period after power from the electronic device has been detected by the detection device because electronic circuits normally needs some time to react to the detection of the presence or absence of the power.

Regarding claim 8, Kiyokazu teaches that the expansion unit according to claim 7 including a storage device configured to store operating commands to execute the preset processing, and wherein the control device executes the preset processing on the basis of the operating commands stored in the storage device (see fig. 3, item 10; section [0010])).

Regarding claim 11, the claim has the same limitations as that of claim 1 and therefore is interpreted and rejected for the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyokazu (Japanese Application Publication number 06-289955) in view of Torin (US Patent 5,519,757).

Regarding claim 9, Kiyokazu, as mentioned above in the rejection of claim 7, teaches an expansion unit (see fig. 4, item PPM of the translation of reference Kiyokazu) powered from an electronic device (see fig. 4, item DS of the translation of reference Kiyokazu) for increasing the functions of said electronic device comprising: a detection device configured to detect the presence or absence of power from the electronic device (see section [0008], lines 1-9); and a control device configured to carry out a given processing (see fig. 3, item 10). However, Kiyokazu fails to teach transmission device configured to transmit a command to stop the supply of power to the expansion unit at the termination of execution of the preset processing by the control device. Torin,

in an analogous art, teaches a transmission device configured to transmit a command to stop the supply of power to the expansion unit at the termination of execution of the preset processing by the control device (col. 4, lines 45-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Torin to Kiyokazu in order to avoid the problem of having the power to support the processor at all time even during the waiting state as taught by Torin (col. 2, lines 17-19).

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kiyokazu (Japanese Application Publication number 06-289955) in view of Shimazaki (US Patent 5,689,821).

Regarding claim 10, Kiyokazu, as mentioned above in the rejection of claim 7, teaches an expansion unit (see fig. 4, item PPM of the translation of reference Kiyokazu) powered from an electronic device (see fig. 4, item DS of the translation of reference Kiyokazu) for increasing the functions of said electronic device comprising: a detection device configured to detect the presence or absence of power from the electronic device (see section [0008], lines 1-9); and a control device configured to carry out a given processing (see fig. 3, item 10). However, Kiyokazu fails to teach a radio communication device, and wherein the control device executes as the preset processing a process of radio communication with another electronic device using the radio communication device. Shimazaki, in an analogous art, teaches a radio

communication device, and wherein the control device executes as the preset processing a process of radio communication with another electronic device using the radio communication device (see fig. 3, item 10; col. 2, lines 18-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to provide the teaching of Hidaka to Kiyokazu for the benefit of being able to have the antenna of the IC card radio in the extended or retracted position based on the judgment of the received signal strength when the card radio is inserted into, or unplugged from personal computer as suggested by Shimazaki (col. 2, lines 20-25).

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.


- a. Ramachandran (US 6,493,326) discloses Method And Apparatus For Saving Power During Punctured Transmission Of Mobile Communications.
- b. Funk et al. (US Patent 6,026,119) discloses Wireless Packet Data Communication Modem And Method Of Use Therein.
- c. Irie (US Patent 6,128,511) discloses Card-Equipped Portable Telephone With Security Feature.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MINH D DAO whose telephone number is 703-305-5589. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, VIVIAN C CHIN can be reached on 703-308-6739. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MINH DAO
Examiner
Art Unit 2682
April 22, 2004 *mgg*


VIVIAN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600
5/3/04